ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES SURVEY, TOPMARK PROPERTY, BONSALL, SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA TM 5427

Submitted to:

County of San Diego
Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B
San Diego, California 92123-1666
(858) 694-2960

Prepared for:

TopMark Development
12520 High Bluff Drive, Suite 380
San Diego, California 92130
(858) 452-2521

Prepared by:

Affinis
Shadow Valley Center
847 Jamacha Road
El Cajon, California 92019
(619) 441-0144

Mary Robbins-Wade, M.A. (RPA)
Director of Cultural Resources

May 2005

Affinis Job No. 2010

USGS quadrangle: Bonsall (7.5' series)
Acreage: 55.9 acres
Keywords: San Diego County; Bonsall; San Luis Rey River; cismontane; negative archaeological survey; potential buried resources; T10S, R3W, Section 20

NATIONAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL DATA BASE INFORMATION

Authors:	Mary Robbins-Wade
Consulting firm:	Affinis, 847 Jamacha Road, El Cajon, California 92019 (619) 441-0144
Report Date:	May 2005
Report Title:	Archaeological Resources Survey, TopMark Property, Bonsall, San Diego County, California. TM 5427
Submitted to:	County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use, 5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B, San Diego, California 92123-1666 (858) 694-2960
Submitted by:	TopMark Development, 12520 High Bluff Drive, Suite 380, San Diego, California 92130 (858) 452-2521
Contract number:	Affinis Job No. 2010
USGS quadrangles:	Bonsall (7.5' series)
Acreage:	55.9 acres
Keywords:	San Diego County; Bonsall; San Luis Rey River; cismontane; negative archaeological survey; potential buried resources; T10S, R3W, Section 20

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FIGURES

CONFIDENTIAL APPENDIX

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

The TopMark property is located in the Bonsall area of northern San Diego County. The property is on the east side of State Route 76 (SR 76), west of Interstate 15 (I-15). West Lilac Road forms the western and northern project boundary. The applicant proposes to development single-family and multi-family residential uses on the 55.9-acre project area.

No historic or archaeological resources have been identified within or adjacent to the project area. Therefore, the project is expected to have no effect on cultural resources. However, the dense vegetation severely limited ground visibility, so there may be resources that could not be seen. While archaeological resources would not be expected on the steep slopes, there are small valleys on the lower portion of the property that are relatively flat and may have archaeological resources that are obscured from view by the dense vegetation. In addition, given the alluvial soils in these small valleys, there is a potential for subsurface cultural resources not visible on the surface. Such buried resources, if they exist, could possess research value to address important research questions, making them potentially significant. Based on these factors, an archaeological monitoring program shall be conducted for the project. An archaeologist and a Native American monitor shall be on-site during all grading, trenching, and other ground-disturbing activities in the specified areas. If archaeological artifact deposits or cultural features are discovered, grading activities shall be directed away from these deposits to allow a determination of potential importance. Recovered materials shall be cataloged and analyzed, and a report shall be completed describing the methods and results of the monitoring and data recovery program.

Implementation of this monitoring program would ensure that development of the project would have no significant impacts to potential buried cultural resources within the project area.

I. INTRODUCTION

PROJECT LOCATION

The TopMark property is located in the Bonsall area of northern San Diego County (Figure 1). The property is on the east side of State Route 76 (SR 76), about four miles west of Interstate 15 (I-15). West Lilac Road forms the western and northern project boundary (Figures 2 and 3). The turnoff of Mission Avenue to Fallbrook is a short distance west of the property (Figure 2). The San Luis Rey River runs just west and north of the project area (Figures 2 and 3). The property is within Township 10 South, Range 3 West, Section 20, on the USGS 7.5' Bonsall quadrangle (Figure 2).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to develop residential uses on the 55.9-acre project area (Figure 3). The project includes a 76-unit condominium lot and an open space lot (Figure 3).

The archaeological project consisted of a survey to assess the presence of cultural resources that would be affected by development of the property. Mary Robbins-Wade served as the project manager/ project archaeologist. This report addresses the methods and results of the survey.

II. ENVIORNMENTAL SETTING

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

The project area is in the foothills of northern San Diego County, where the climate is characterized as Mediterranean hot summer. Average annual temperatures range form a January low of about 40° to 43° F to a July high of about 85° F, and annual rainfall averages about 15 inches (Griner and Pryde 1976). The parcel lies within the San Luis Rey River floodplain, and the river runs through the eastern portion of the property (Figure 2). The river would have provided a source of fresh water for native inhabitants of the area. There are numerous other steams in the vicinity, including Bonsall Creek, Moosa Canyon, and other unnamed drainages (Figure 2). So, water should have been in ample supply.

Geologically, the upland portions of the project area consist of Mesozoic granitic rocks, while the lower portions, near the San Luis Rey River, are mapped as Quaternary alluvium (Rogers 1965). The U.S. Soil Conservation Service (Bowman 1973) maps three soil types on the property. About half of the project area is mapped as Fallbrook sandy loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes, eroded. Other upland areas are mapped as Fallbrook sandy loam, 9 to 30 percent slopes, severely eroded, and Cienba coarse sandy loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes, eroded. The lower, flatter portions of

Figure 1 Regional Location in San Diego County

Figure 2 Project Location on USGS 7.5' Bonsall Quadrangle

Figure 3 Project Plans

11 x 17

REPLACE THIS PAGE AND NEXT WITH 11 X 17 FIGURE

FIG 3 page 2

the site are Bonsall sandy loam, 2 to 9 percent slopes, and Placentia sandy loam, 9 to 15 percent slopes, eroded (Bowman 1973).

The vast majority of the property supports coastal sage scrub or disturbed coastal sage scrub, with some areas of non-native grassland. There is one pocket of riparian woodland. Riparian vegetation, such as willows, cottonwoods, mulefat, poison oak, and arundo (non-native) is found along the San Luis Rey River. Tree tobacco has been noted in the area. Although this is a non-native plant, the Luiseño made of use it following its introduction. During archaeological studies for SR 76, Rosen (1984) noted that riparian woodland and inland sage scrub were noted along the highway corridor. "Oaks occur sporadically throughout the region, approaching an oak woodland community in a few places along the river" (Rosen 1984:11).

These various vegetation communities would have provided a number of plant species known to have been used by the Luiseño people for food, medicine, tools, shelter, ceremonial and other uses (Bean and Shipek 1978; Sparkman 1908). Many of the animal species found in these communities would have been used by native populations as well.

CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT

General Culture History

Several summaries discuss the prehistory of San Diego County and provide a background for understanding the archaeology of the general area surrounding the project. Moratto's (1984) review of the archaeology of California contains important discussions of Southern California, including the San Diego area. Bull (1983, 1987), Carrico (1987), Gallegos (1987), and Warren (1985, 1987) provide summaries of recent work and interpretations. The following is a brief discussion of the culture history of the San Diego region.

Carter (1957, 1978, 1980), Minshall (1976) and others (e.g., Childers 1974; Davis 1968, 1973) have long argued for the presence of Pleistocene humans in California, including the San Diego area. The sites identified as "early man" are all controversial. Carter and Minshall are best known for their discoveries at Texas Street and Buchanan Canyon. The material from these sites is generally considered nonartifactual, and the investigative methodology is often questioned (Moratto 1984).

The earliest accepted archaeological manifestation of Native Americans in the San Diego area is the San Dieguito complex, dating to approximately 10,000 years ago (Warren 1967). The San Dieguito complex was originally defined by Rogers (1939), and Warren published a clear synthesis of the complex in 1967. The material culture of the San Dieguito complex consists primarily of scrapers, scraper planes, choppers, large blades, and large projectile points. Rogers considered crescentic stones to be characteristic of the San Dieguito complex as well. Tools and debitage made of fine-grained green metavolcanic material, locally known as felsite, were found at many sites which Rogers identified as San Dieguito. Often these artifacts were heavily patinated.

Felsite tools, especially patinated felsite, came to be seen as an indicator of the San Dieguito complex. Until relatively recently, many archaeologists felt that the San Dieguito culture lacked milling technology and saw this as an important difference between the San Dieguito and La Jolla complexes. Sleeping circles, trail shrines, and rock alignments have also been associated with early San Dieguito sites. The San Dieguito complex is chronologically equivalent to other Paleoindian complexes across North America, and sites are sometimes called "Paleoindian" rather than "San Dieguito". San Dieguito material underlies La Jolla complex strata at the C. W. Harris site in San Dieguito Valley (Warren, ed. 1966).

The traditional view of San Diego prehistory has the San Dieguito complex followed by the La Jolla complex at least 7000 years ago, possibly as long as 9000 years ago (Rogers 1966). The La Jolla complex is part of the Encinitas tradition and equates with Wallace's (1955) Millingstone Horizon, also known as Early Archaic or Milling Archaic. The Encinitas tradition is generally "recognized by millingstone assemblages in shell middens, often near sloughs and lagoons" (Moratto 1984:147). "Crude" cobble tools, especially choppers and scrapers, characterize the La Jolla complex (Moriarty 1966). Basin metates, manos, discoidals, a small number of Pinto series and Elko series points, and flexed burials are also characteristic.

Warren et al. (1961) proposed that the La Jolla complex developed with the arrival of a desert people on the coast who quickly adapted to their new environment. Moriarty (1966) and Kaldenberg (1976) have suggested an in situ development of the La Jolla people from the San Dieguito. Moriarty has since proposed a Pleistocene migration of an ancestral stage of the La Jolla people to the San Diego coast. He suggested this Pre-La Jolla complex is represented at Texas Street, Buchanan Canyon, and the Brown site (Moriarty 1987).

In recent years, archaeologists in the region have begun to question the traditional definition of San Dieguito people simply as makers of finely crafted felsite projectile points, domed scrapers, and discoidal cores, who lacked milling technology. The traditional defining criteria for La Jolla sites (manos, metates, "crude" cobble tools, and reliance on lagoonal resources) have also been questioned (Bull 1987; Cárdenas and Robbins-Wade 1985; Robbins-Wade 1986). There is speculation that differences between artifact assemblages of "San Dieguito" and "La Jolla" sites reflect functional differences rather than temporal or cultural variability (Bull 1987; Gallegos 1987). Gallegos (1987) has proposed that the San Dieguito, La Jolla, and Pauma complexes are manifestations of the same culture, with differing site types "explained by site location, resources exploited, influence, innovation and adaptation to a rich coastal region over a long period of time" (Gallegos 1987:30). The classic "La Jolla" assemblage is one adapted to life on the coast and appears to continue through time (Robbins-Wade 1986; Winterrowd and Cárdenas 1987). Inland sites adapted to hunting contain a different tool kit, regardless of temporal period (Cárdenas and Van Wormer 1984).

Several archaeologists in San Diego, however, do not subscribe to the Early Prehistoric/Late Prehistoric chronology (see Cook 1985; Gross and Hildebrand 1998; Gross and Robbins-Wade 1989; Shackley 1988; Warren 1998). They feel that an apparent overlap among assemblages

identified as "La Jolla," "Pauma," or "San Dieguito" does not preclude the existence of an Early Milling period culture in the San Diego region, whatever name is used to identify it, separate from an earlier culture. One problem these archaeologists perceive is that many site reports in the San Diego region present conclusions based on interpretations of stratigraphic profiles from sites at which stratigraphy cannot validly be used to address chronology or changes through time. Archaeology emphasizes stratigraphy as a tool, but many of the sites known in the San Diego region are not in depositional situations. In contexts where natural sources of sediment or anthropogenic sources of debris to bury archaeological materials are lacking, other factors must be responsible for the subsurface occurrence of cultural materials. The subsurface deposits at numerous sites are the result of such agencies as rodent burrowing and insect activity. Recent work has emphasized the importance of bioturbative factors in producing the stratigraphic profiles observed at archaeological sites (see Gross 1992). Different classes of artifacts move through the soil in different ways (Bocek 1986; Erlandson 1984; Johnson 1989), creating vertical patterning (Johnson 1989) that is not culturally relevant. Many sites which have been used to help define the culture sequence of the San Diego region are the result of just such nondepositional stratigraphy.

The Late Prehistoric period is represented by the San Luis Rey complex in northern San Diego County and the Cuyamaca complex in the southern portion of the county. The San Luis Rey complex is the archaeological manifestation of the Shoshonean predecessors of the ethnohistoric Luiseño (named for the San Luis Rey Mission). The Cuyamaca complex represents the Yuman forebears of the Kumeyaay (Diegueño, named for the San Diego Mission). Agua Hedionda is traditionally considered to be the point of separation between Luiseño and Northern Diegueño territories.

The San Luis Rey complex (SLR) is divided into two phases, SLR I and SLR II. Elements of the SLR complex include small, triangular, pressure-flaked projectile points (generally Cottonwood series, but Desert side-notched series also occurs); milling implements: mortars and pestles, manos and metates, and bedrock milling features; bone awls; *Olivella* shell beads; other stone and shell ornaments; and cremations (Meighan 1954; Moratto 1984; True et al. 1974). The later SLR II complex also includes several elements not found in the SLR I complex: "pottery vessels, cremation urns, red and black pictographs, and such nonaboriginal items as metal knives and glass beads (Meighan 1954:223).

SLR I was originally thought to date from A.D. 1400 to A.D. 1750, with SLR II dating between A.D. 1750 and A.D. 1850 (Meighan 1954). However, that division was based on the assumption that the Luiseño did not practice pottery manufacture until just prior to the arrival of the Spanish. The chronology has since been revised due to evidence that pottery may have been introduced to the Luiseño circa A.D. 1200-1600. Ceramics were probably introduced from the Luiseños' southern neighbors, the Kumeyaay (True et al. 1974).

Ethnography

The name Luiseño derives from Mission San Luis Rey de Francia and has been used to refer to the Indians associated with the mission. The Luiseño language belongs to the Cupan group of the Takic subfamily, which has also been called Southern California Shoshonean, and is part of the widespread Uto-Aztecan language family (Bean and Shipek 1978; Sparkman 1908; White 1963). Neighboring groups that speak Cupan languages are Cupeño, Cahuilla, and Gabrielino. The Indians associated with Mission San Juan Capistrano, called Juaneño by the Spanish, have sometimes been described as a separate group. The language, culture, and territory of the Luiseño and Juaneño is so closely related that the two are generally considered to be a single ethnic nationality (Bean and Shipek 1978; White 1963); however, many Luiseño and Juaneño consider themselves to be separate groups. Cameron (1987:319-321) has noted archaeological differences between the two groups.

The territory of the Luiseño Indians is generally described as extending along the coast from Agua Hedionda Creek on the southwest to Aliso Creek on the northwest. On the north this boundary extended east beyond Santiago Peak to the eastern side of the Elsinore Fault Valley, continuing southeast to Palomar Mountain, then around the southern slope above the valley of San Jose. The southern boundary follows westerly to Agua Hedionda Creek (Bean and Shipek 1978; White 1963).

Luiseño social organization is noted for "(1) extensive proliferation of social statuses, (2) clearly defined ruling families that interlocked various rancherias within the ethnic nationality, (3) a sophisticated philosophical structure associated with the taking of hallucinogenics (datura), and (4) elaborate ritual paraphernalia including sand paintings symbolic of an avenging sacred being named Chinigchingish" (Bean and Shipek 1978:550).

Ethnographic and ethnohistoric studies of the Luiseño include Bean and Shipek (1978), Boscana (1947), Kroeber (1976), Robinson (1947), Shipek (1977), Sparkman (1908), Talley (1982), and White (1963). Archaeological studies addressing the Late Prehistoric San Luis Rey complex include Meighan (1954), McCown (1955), True et al. (1974), and Wallace (1960). Most of the ethnographic studies, as well as the "classic" archaeological studies of the Luiseño, have concentrated on the Pauma Valley and the Palomar Mountain area, although Wallace's (1960) study was an archaeological survey of the Buena Vista Creek watershed.

Project Vicinity

CA-SDI-674 (which includes CA-SDI-8663), identified as a Late Prehistoric San Luis Rey II/Luiseño habitation site, is located less than ½ mile southwest of the current project area (see Confidential Appendix A). Rosen noted that, "data collected by Oxendine (1983) indicated that CA-SDi-674 might be the ethnographic Luiseño village of *Kwalam* (Harrington n.d.; Kroeber 1907:147, 1925:648; Swanton 1952:498). At present very few references mention *Kwalam.* It is shown in the literature on Luiseño village maps and mentioned by Kroeber and Harrington as

being located at Bonsall. Harrington's placename location for *Kwalam* was obtained from field data collected during the 1920s and 1930s (Oxendine 1983:78-79)" (Rosen 1984:7). It is not known precisely where Harrington meant when he referred to Bonsall as the location of *Kwalam*, but after visiting CA-SDI-674, Oxendine indicated that "'geographically, the site is the best fit for the placename *Kwalam* that I have come across' (Oxendine, personal communication, April 1983)" (Rosen 1984:8). Unfortunately, the great amount of disturbance at the site, especially in the area of Locus A, have made it impossible to adequately assess Oxendine's suggestion (Rosen 1984).

III. PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Records searches were conducted at the South Coastal Information Center at San Diego State University and at the San Diego Museum of Man. The records searches covered the project area and a one-mile radius around it (Confidential Appendix A). Five archaeological sites and one isolated find have been recorded within a mile of the project area, one of which (CA-SDI-674) includes multiple loci. (The records search from the South Coastal Information Center shows CA-SDI-674 and CA-SDI-8663 as separate sites; however, because CA-SDI-8663 surrounds CA-SDI-674, they have been addressed as a single site [Laylander 2003; Rosen 1982, 1984, 1991]). The sites recorded in the vicinity include a large habitation site (CA-SDI-674), two small camp sites recorded by D.L. True in 1960, a sparse artifact scatter, and a light density shell scatter with no artifacts noted. The isolated find included a shallow basin metate fragment and a bifacial mano. All the cultural resources recorded in the vicinity are southwest of the project area (see Confidential Appendix A).

IV. RESEARCH METHODS

The project area was surveyed for cultural resources by Affinis archaeologists Matt Murray and Matt Sivba, under the direction of Mary Robbins-Wade, on April 22, 2005. Where possible, the area was walked in parallel transects spaced 10 m apart. Due to the steep terrain over most of the property, such transects were not feasible except in the small valleys at the base of the slopes. One area on the northwestern end of the property contained several granitic bedrock outcrops, which overlooked a small valley; these outcrops were checked for milling elements. Ground visibility was extremely poor, due to dense vegetation. Even previously cut firebreaks were overgrown with grasses and weeds at the time of the survey.

The site was visited by Mark Mojado, representing the San Luis Rey Band of Luiseño Mission Indians in May 2005. The State Native American Heritage Commission was contacted for a records search of their sacred lands files. The senior archaeologist met with Mark Mojado of the San Luis Rey Band to discuss the project site.

The senior archaeologist reviewed previous archaeological reports relevant to the current project area. Historic maps and aerial photographs were also reviewed to determine the potential for historic archaeological resources.

V. RESULTS

No archaeological resources had been previously recorded within or adjacent to the property, and none were found during the current survey. Ground visibility was extremely poor, due to dense vegetation cover. So, there may be artifactual material that could not been seen. However, the vast majority of the project area is quite steep, and archaeological resources would not be expected there. Small processing sites may be expected on the ridge tops, and the areas of gentler slopes in the small valleys between the ridge fingers may have been used by native populations. In addition to the steep slopes, the general lack of bedrock outcrops within the project area may have made this location less desirable for habitation than other areas along the San Luis Rey River. One area contained several granitic bedrock outcrops, which were checked for milling elements. No milling was observed.

While most of the property consists of steep slopes and ridge tops, the lower portions of the project area are in the floodplain of the San Luis Rey River. Given this alluvial setting, there is a potential for encountering subsurface cultural resources in these small valleys, with little or no evidence on the surface. In several places along the San Luis Rey River in the City of Oceanside, significant buried cultural resources have been encountered recently during monitoring of grading. Reports of two of these monitoring programs (Mission Wells, Waniš) are currently in preparation.

The review of historic maps showed no buildings within the project area in the past. Maps reviewed included 1901 USGS 30' San Luis Rey quadrangle and 1948 USGS 7.5' Bonsall quadrangle. Aerial photographs taken in 1928, on file at the County of San Diego Cartographic Services, also showed no buildings or structures on the property. The configuration of the roadways in the area (SR 76, Olive Hill Road, Camino del Rey, West Lilac Road, Mission Road to Fallbrook) in the 1928 aerial photograph is generally the same as the current configuration.

VI. IMPACTS, SIGNIFICANCE, AND MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code §5024.1, Title 14 CCR Section 4852) including the following:

- Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
- Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values, or:
- Has yielded or may be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history.

No historic or archaeological resources have been identified within or adjacent to the project area. Therefore, the project is expected to have no effect on cultural resources. However, the dense vegetation severely limited ground visibility, so there may be resources that could not be seen. While archaeological resources would not be expected on the steep slopes, there are small valleys on the lower portion of the property that are relatively flat and may have archaeological resources that are obscured from view by the dense vegetation. In addition, given the alluvial soils in these small valleys, there is a potential for subsurface cultural resources not visible on the surface. Such buried resources, if they exist, could possess research value to address important research questions, making them potentially significant. Based on these factors, an archaeological monitoring program shall be conducted for the project. Specifically, the program will consist of the following:

1. Prior to implementation of the monitoring, a pre-excavation agreement shall be developed between the appropriate Luiseño Band(s), the project applicant, and the County of San Diego.
2. The qualified archaeologist and the Native American representative shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the contractors to explain the requirements of the program.
3. An archaeologist and a Native American monitor shall be on-site during all grading, trenching, and other ground-disturbing activities in the specified areas (Figure 4).
4. If archaeological artifact deposits or cultural features are discovered, grading activities shall be directed away from these deposits to allow a determination of potential importance. Isolates and clearly non-significant deposits will be minimally documented in the field, and grading shall proceed. For any potentially significant artifact deposits, an adequate artifact sample to address research avenues previously identified for sites along the San Luis Rey River will be collected using professional archaeological collection methods.
5. Recovered materials shall be cataloged and analyzed.
6. A report shall be completed describing the methods and results of the monitoring and data recovery program.
7. Artifacts shall be curated with accompanying catalog to current professional repository standards or the collection will be repatriated to the Luiseño Bands, as specified in the pre-excavation agreement.

Implementation of this monitoring program would ensure that development of the project would have no significant impacts to potential buried cultural resources within the project area.

Figure 4 Areas to be Monitored

11 x 17

REPLACE THIS PAGE AND NEXT WITH 11 X 17 FIGUR

FIGURE 4 PAGE 2

VII. INDIVIDUALS AND AGENCIES CONSULTED

Archaeological Records Search Department	San Diego Museum of Man
David Cantarino	South Coastal Information Center
Carol Gaubatz	Native American Heritage Commission
Mark Mojado	San Luis Rey Band of Luiseño Mission Indians

VIII. PERSONNEL

The following persons participated in the preparation of this report:

Mary Robbins-Wade, M.A. (RPA)	Director of Cultural Resources
Matt Murray, B.A.	Archaeologist
Matt Sivba, B.A.	Archaeologist
Richard Knauel, M.A.	Graphic Artist

IX. REFERENCES

Bean, L.J., and F.C. Shipek

1978 Luiseño. In *California*, edited by R.F. Heizer, pp. 550-563. *The Handbook of North American Indians*, vol. 8. W.C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Bocek, B.

1986 Rodent Ecology and Burrowing Behavior: Predicted Effects on Archaeological Site Formation. *American Antiquity* 51:589-603.

Boscana, G.

1947 *Chinigchinich. A Historical Account of the Origin, Customs, and Traditions of the Indians at the Missionary Establishment of St. Juan Capistrano, Alta-California*. Translated by A. Robinson. Biobooks, Oakland.

Bowman, R.H.

1973 *Soil Survey, San Diego Area, California, Part I.* United States Department of Agriculture, Beltsville, MD.

Bull, C.S.

1983 Shaking the Foundations: The Evidence for San Diego Prehistory. *Casual Papers: Cultural Resource Management* 1(3):15-64. Cultural Resource Management Center, San Diego State University.

1987 A New Proposal: Some Suggestions for San Diego Prehistory. In *San Dieguito-La Jolla: Chronology and Controversy*, edited by D. Gallegos, pp. 35-42. San Diego County Archaeological Society, Research Paper 1.

Cameron, C.

1987 *Archaeological Investigations on the Rancho San Clemente, Orange County, California*. Archaeological Research Facility California State University, Fullerton.

Cárdenas, D.S., and M. Robbins-Wade

1985 *An Archaeological Investigation of SDM-W-143/146: An Unique Coastal Luiseño Occupation Site in Carlsbad, California*. RBR & Associates, Inc., San Diego. Submitted to the City of Carlsbad, Planning Department. Report on file at South Coastal Information Center, San Diego State University.

Cárdenas, D.S., and S.R. Van Wormer

1984 *Archaeological Investigation of SDI-4648 and SDM-W-348.* RBR & Associates, Inc., San Diego. Submitted to the City of El Cajon, Planning Department. Report on file at South Coastal Information Center, San Diego State University.

Carrico, R.L.

1987 Sixty-five Years of San Diego County Archaeology. In *San Dieguito-La Jolla: Chronology and Controversy*, edited by D. Gallegos, pp. 1-14. San Diego County Archaeological Society, Research Paper 1.

Carter, G.F.

1957 *Pleistocene Man at San Diego.* Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore.

1978 An American Lower Paleolithic. *Anthropological Journal of Canada* 16:2-38.

1980 *Earlier Than You Think: A Personal View of Man in America.* Texas A&M University Press, College Station.

Childers, W.M.

1974 Preliminary Report on the Yuha Burial, California. *Anthropological Journal of Canada* 12 (1):2-9.

Cook, J.R.

1985 *An Investigation of the San Dieguito Quarries and Workshops Near Rancho Santa Fe, California.* Mooney-Lettieri and Associates, San Diego. Submitted to County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. Report on file at South Coastal Information Center, San Diego State University.

Davis, E.L.

1968 Early Man in the Mojave Desert. *Eastern New Mexico University Contributions in Anthropology* 1 (4):42-47.

1973 People of the Old Stone Age at China Lake. Ms., on file at Great Basin Foundation, San Diego.

Erlandson, J.M.

1984 A Case Study in Faunalturbation: Delineating the Effects of the Burrowing Pocket Gopher on the Distribution of Archaeological Materials. *American Antiquity* 49:785-790.

Gallegos, D.
1987 A Review and Synthesis of Environmental and Cultural Material for the Batiquitos Lagoon Region. In *San Dieguito-La Jolla: Chronology and Controversy*, edited by D. Gallegos, pp. 23-34. San Diego County Archaeological Society, Research Paper 1.

Griner, E.L., and P.R. Pryde
1976 Climate, Soils, and Vegetation. In *San Diego: An Introduction to the Region*, edited by P.R. Pryde, pp. 29-46. Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, Dubuque, Iowa.

Gross, G.T.
1992 Site Formation and Transformation Processes in Coastal Shell Middens and Shell-Rich Sites. In *Essays on the Prehistory of Maritime California*, edited by T. L. Jones, pp. 195-204. Center for Archaeological Research at Davis Publications 10, University of California, Davis.

Gross, G.T., and J.A. Hildebrand
1998 San Dieguito and La Jolla: Insights from the 1964 Excavations at the C.W. Harris Site. Paper presented at the 32nd Annual Meeting of the Society for California Archaeology, San Diego.

Gross, G.T., and M. Robbins-Wade
1989 *Archaeological Investigation of SDi-9772 (SDM-W-3411) San Marcos, California.* Affinis, El Cajon. Submitted to County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. Report on file at South Coastal Information Center, San Diego State University.

Johnson, D.L.
1989 Subsurface Stone Lines, Stone Zones, Artifact-Manuport Layers, and Biomantles Produced by Bioturbation Via Pocket Gophers (*Thomomys bottae*). *American Antiquity* 54:370-389.

Kaldenberg, R.L.
1976 *Paleo-technological Change at Rancho Park North, San Diego County, California.* Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Anthropology, San Diego State University.

Kroeber, A.L.
1976 *Handbook of California Indians.* Dover, New York. Originally published 1925 as *Bulletin 78* of the Bureau of American Ethnology of the Smithsonian Institution.

Laylander, D.
2003 *Archaeological Survey Report for the State Route 76 Widening and Realignment Project Near Bonsall, San Diego County, California.* 11-SD-76 K.P. 12.1/20.0 (P.M. 7.5-12.4) EA 080100. ASM Affiliates, Inc. Encinitas, CA. Report submitted to Caltrans, District 11, San Diego.

McCown, B.E.
1955 *Temeku. A Page from the History of the Luiseño Indians.* Archaeological Survey Association of Southern California Paper No. 3.

Meighan, C.W.
1954 A Late Complex in Southern California Prehistory. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 10(2):215-227.

Minshall, H.L.
1976 *The Broken Stones.* Copley Books, San Diego.

Moratto, M.J.
1984 *California Archaeology.* Academic Press, Orlando.

Moriarty, J.R., III
1966 Cultural Phase Divisions Suggested By Typological Change Coordinated with Stratigraphically Controlled Radiocarbon Dating in San Diego. *The Anthropological Journal of Canada* 4 (4):20-30.

1987 A Separate Origins Theory for Two Early Man Cultures in California. In *San Dieguito-La Jolla: Chronology and Controversy*, edited by D. Gallegos, pp. 49-60. San Diego County Archaeological Society, Research Paper 1.

Robbins-Wade, M.
1986 Rising Glen: SDM-W-143/146 (SDI-5213 C & D). *Casual Papers* 2 (2):37-58. Cultural Resource Management Center, San Diego State University.

1988 Coastal Luiseño: Refining the San Luis Rey Complex. *Proceedings of the Society for California Archaeology, Fresno, California* 1:75-95. Society for California Archaeology, San Diego.

Robinson, A.
1947 *Life in California.* Biobooks, Oakland.

Rogers, M.J.

1939 *Early Lithic Industries of the Lower Basin of the Colorado River and Adjacent Desert Areas*. San Diego Museum of Man Papers No. 3. San Diego Museum of Man.

1966 *Ancient Hunters of the Far West*. Union-Tribune Publishing Company, San Diego.

Rogers, T.H.

1965 *Santa Ana Sheet, Geologic Map of California*. California Division of Mines and Geology, Sacramento.

Rosen, M.D.

1984 *Final Report of an Archaeological Test Excavation at CA-SDI-674, Bonsall, California*. 11-SD-76 P.M. 12.0 11359-184550. Caltrans, District 11, San Diego. Report on file at South Coastal Information Center, San Diego State University.

1991 *Archaeological Survey Report State Route 76 from North Santa Fe Avenue in Oceanside to Interstate 15*. 11-SD-76 P.M. R7.1-R17.6 11222-010340. Caltrans, District 11, San Diego. Report on file at South Coastal Information Center, San Diego State University.

Shackley, M.S.

1988 *Archaeological Investigations at SDi-5103. A San Dieguito Lithic Workshop, San Diego County, California*. Brian F. Mooney Associates, San Diego.

Shipek, F.C.

1977 *A Strategy for Change. The Luiseño of Southern California*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawaii. University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Sparkman, P.S.

1908 The Culture of the Luiseño Indians. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 8(4):187-234.

Talley, R.P.

1982 *The Life History of a Luiseño Indian: James (Jim) Martinez*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Anthropology, San Diego State University.

True, D.L., C.W. Meighan, and H. Crew

1974 Archaeological Investigations at Molpa, San Diego County, California. *University of California Publications in Anthropology 11*, Berkeley.

Wallace, W.J.

1955 A Suggested Chronology for Southern California Coastal Archaeology. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 11:214-230.

1960 Archaeological Resources of the Buena Vista Watershed, San Diego County, California. *University of California, Los Angeles Archaeological Survey Annual Report 1959-1960*:277-300.

Warren, C.N.

1967 The San Dieguito Complex: A Review and Hypothesis. *American Antiquity* 32:168-185.

1985 Garbage About the Foundations: A Comment on Bull's Assertions. *Casual Papers: Cultural Resource Management* 2(1):82-90. Cultural Resource Management Center, San Diego State University.

1987 The San Dieguito and La Jolla: Some Comments. In *San Dieguito-La Jolla: Chronology and Controversy*, edited by D. Gallegos, pp. 73-85. San Diego County Archaeological Society, Research Paper 1.

1998 San Dieguito-La Jolla: Chronology and Controversy, Ten Years Later. Discussant in symposium at the 32nd Annual Meeting of the Society for California Archaeology, San Diego.

Warren, C.N. (editor)

1966 *The San Dieguito Type Site: M. J. Rogers' 1938 Excavation on the San Dieguito River*. San Diego Museum Papers No. 5. San Diego Museum of Man.

Warren, C.N., D.L. True, and A.A. Eudey

1961 Early Gathering Complexes of Western San Diego County: Results and Interpretations of an Archaeological Survey. *University of California, Los Angeles Archaeological Survey Annual Report 1960-1961*, pp. 1-106. Department of Anthropology, University of California, Los Angeles.

White, R.C.

1963 Luiseño Social Organization. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 48(2):91-194.

Winterrowd, C.L., and D.S. Cárdenas

1987 *An Archaeological Indexing of a Portion of the Village of La Rinconada de Jamo SDI-5017 (SDM-W-150)*. RBR & Associates, Inc., San Diego. Submitted to the City of Carlsbad, Planning Department. Report on file at South Coastal Information Center, San Diego State University.

CONFIDENTIAL APPENDIX TO ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES SURVEY, TOPMARK PROPERTY, BONSALL, SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNI TM 5427

NOT FOR PUBLIC REVIEW

Submitted to:

County of San Diego
Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B
San Diego, California 92123-1666
(858) 694-2960

Prepared for:

TopMark Development
12520 High Bluff Drive, Suite 380
San Diego, California 92130
(858) 452-2521

Prepared by:

Affinis
Shadow Valley Center
847 Jamacha Road
El Cajon, California 92019
(619) 441-0144

Mary Robbins-Wade, M.A. (RPA)
Director of Cultural Resources

May 2005

Affinis Job No. 2010

CONFIDENTIAL APPENDIX A

RECORDS SEARCHES